

National Network of Libraries of Medicine

Outreach Evaluation Resource Center

Quarterly Report

November 1, 2009 – January 31, 2010

University of Washington

Date submitted: July 20, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive summary	2
Classes and consultations	2
Web site	3
Dissemination of effective practices	3
Subcontractor update	n/a
Other staff activities	3
Appendix: OERC Review Recommendations	5

Executive summary

Major activities during this quarter included focus groups with Community Day pilot project participants; consultation with MAR about Appreciative Inquiry; initial arrangements for the upcoming assessment of RML staff use of Adobe Connect and focus groups with network member participants in the NEPR project; planning for training that will take place during future months; coordination of two Evaluation Liaison teleconferences; and analysis of recommendations resulting from the September, 2009 OERC Center review.

Classes and consultations

TABLE 1. Classes and consultations

11/10/2009	Barnes, Olney	Consultation: Community Day focus group (Brunswick, ME)	Lisa Boyd, NNO, Bethesda, MD
11/12/2009	Barnes, Olney	Consultation: Community Day focus group (Sarasota, FL)	Lisa Boyd, NNO, Bethesda, MD
11/18/2009	Olney	Training: Clever Evaluation	Sue Hunter, MAR, New York, NY
11/19/2009	Olney	Consultation: MAR member request	Julia Stuart, New York Hospital Queens, Flushing, NY
11/19/2009	Barnes	Consultation: NLM Associate Fellows program	Kathel Dunn, NLM, Bethesda, MD
11/20/2009	Barnes	Consultation: Evaluation results presentation	Claire Hamasu, MCR, Salt Lake City, UT
11/23/2009	Olney	Consultation: session evaluation consultation	Sabrina Kurtz-Rossi, Boston, MA
11/30/2009	Barnes, Olney	Consultation: Community Day focus group (Oklahoma City, OK)	Lisa Boyd, NNO, Bethesda, MD
12/2/2009	Barnes, Olney	Consultation: Evaluation liaisons teleconference	Evaluation liaisons, NNO, Bethesda, MD
12/8/2009	Barnes	Consultation: Outreach Connections	Claire Hamasu, MCR, Salt Lake City, UT
12/9/2009	Barnes, Olney	Consultation: Network Member focus groups	Kate Oliver, MAR, New York, NY
12/22/2009	Barnes	Consultation: NEPR Toolkit usability study	Michael Boer, Web-STOC, Seattle, WA
12/23/2009	Barnes, Olney	Consultation: MAR member focus groups	Sue Hunter, MAR, New York, NY
1/7/2010	Barnes	Consultation: NEPR Toolkit usability study	Michael Boer, Web-STOC, Seattle, WA
1/11/2010	Olney	Consultation: MAR member focus groups	Sue Hunter, MAR, New York, NY
1/11/2010	Barnes	Consultation: RML Directors' Meeting	Angela Ruffin, NNO, Bethesda, MD

1/12/2010	Barnes	Consultation: GMR training	Ruth Holst, GMR, Chicago, IL
1/20/2010	Olney	Consultation: MAR member focus groups	Sue Hunter, MAR, New York, NY
1/21/2010	Olney	Consultation: MAR member focus groups	Sue Hunter, MAR, New York, NY
1/22/2010	Olney	Consultation: MAR focus groups	Sue Hunter, MAR, New York, NY
1/25/2010	Barnes	Consultation: GMR training	Ruth Holst, GMR, Chicago, IL
1/25/2010	Barnes	Consultation: AEA paper proposals	Alan Carr, PSR, Los Angeles, CA
1/26/2010	Barnes, Olney	Consultation: Evaluation liaisons teleconference	Evaluation liaisons, NNO, Bethesda, MD
1/27/2010	Barnes	Consultation: GMR training	Ruth Holst, GMR, Chicago, IL

Web site

Two postings were added to the OERC Blog, both announcements: the availability of a new blog from the American Evaluation Association, and the online availability of slides from the October, 2009 Oregon Program Evaluators Network.

Dissemination of effective practices

Susan Barnes participated in the initial meeting of the new Outreach Connections promotion subcommittee.

Subcontractor update

Not applicable. The OERC has no subcontracts at present.

Other staff activities—this section is organized according to OERC’s goals for the 2006-2011 contract

I. *Develop awareness, skill, and capacity in use of evaluation methods.*

Training:

Cindy Olney and Susan Barnes participated in planning discussions on 12/9 and 12/23 for Mid-Atlantic Region Appreciative Inquiry focus group training and Cindy trained the MAR staff to conduct focus groups in January. (Part of the training involved her conducting focus groups with the MAR staff to model the process.). The remainder of the quarter featured preparation for future training. Susan conducted planning with GMR on 1/12 and 1/25 for providing two classes in Chicago, and team-teaching one with Jacqueline Leskovec. Susan and Jacqueline then began to update the Community Assessment class. Susan contacted all eight regions’ Evaluation Liaisons regarding strategies for bringing OERC classes to chapter meetings and began to contact chapters. Susan and Cindy compiled and submitted instructor and course information to MLA for classes to be taught at the May 2010 annual meeting.

II. Develop mechanisms to disseminate and use evaluation findings to help NLM and the NN/LM document and demonstrate their accomplishments

Publications:

The OERC distributed 7 sets of the *Planning and Evaluating Health Information Outreach* booklets and 10 copies of the *Measuring the Difference* guide.

III. Strengthen and build an evaluation culture throughout NN/LM.

Evaluation Liaisons:

The OERC coordinated and led two Evaluation Liaisons meetings this quarter. On 12/2, Alan Carr talked about an evaluation process that he, Heidi, and Sue Yasharpour designed to assess proposals submitted for three major awards and Nikki Dettmar described an assessment of the Technology Tuesday postings, which are short articles about technology posted weekly (on Tuesday) to the PNR online blog *Dragonfly* (<http://nml.gov/pnr/dragonfly/>). On 1/26, Cindy Olney gave a presentation about training for Appreciative Inquiry focus groups, and Jacqueline Leskovec presented information about GMR's outreach impact study.

Evaluation:

Susan Barnes and Cindy Olney provided Angela Ruffin with the OERC response to recommendations received by the OERC review team as a result of the Center review that took place in September, 2009. OERC staff also obtained approval from NNO for the Adobe Connect Use by RML Staff focus group guide.

VI. Provide consultation and direction in implementing evaluation systems, structures, and resources to help the NN/LM's efficacy and efficiency.

Consultations are listed in Table 1, above.

V. Enhance and refine use of community-based approaches to evaluation.

Cross-regional collaboration

OERC staff completed focus groups with participants from the three Community Day pilot sites—Brunswick, ME on 11/10; Sarasota, FL on 11/12; and Oklahoma City, OK on 11/30. Community Day interview and focus group initial draft summaries were completed. Susan and Cindy also worked on procedures for scheduling NEPR focus groups during the MLA annual meeting in May.

Susan participated in presenting results from the spring, 2009 focused discussions to the Outreach Connections Steering Committee and took a leadership role in determining presentation approach and in establishing timeline for completing presentation content.

Susan provided assistance to Web-STOC in its identification of regional Emergency Preparedness coordinators for the NEPR Toolkit on 1/7.

Appendix 1

OERC Site Review

Responses to Recommendations, provided to Angela Ruffin on 12/9/2009

The OERC has reviewed the recommendations from the final report of the 9/18/09 OERC review. We have created this list of the recommendations and our resulting plans or responses. These are grouped according to our view of their priorities and with an eye to what we would plan to complete before the end of the contract in April, 2011.

When grouping into first and next-level priorities, we have kept in mind our existing commitments to NNO for the evaluations of the National Emergency Preparedness Project, the Community Day Pilot Projects, and Adobe Use by RML Staff. We have also kept in mind our commitment to teach two classes at the 2010 Medical Library Association annual meeting and the contractual requirement to continue to offer consulting and teaching services.

There were two recommendations regarding effective practices and lessons learned—we have grouped them in a separate category because it is our belief that addressing them will be part of the Outreach Applications Redesign Working Group's considerations. They are in no way lower in priority, but they do depend on factors that are beyond OERC influence.

There were some recommendations that we felt to be out of the OERC's scope, and others that we found puzzling. We've indicated those in this list.

We welcome your input and suggestions about these recommendations and our approach to them.

Recommendations from the OERC Review Final Report

First Priority—What we will do or are already doing

- It would be good in year 05 for the OERC to evaluate its own training and consultation over the period of this contract. Perhaps an evaluation could be created that is more helpful than the MLA CE evaluation, but not as much work as the *Measuring Your Impact* evaluation.
 - We began this evaluation in Y4 and will revisit it, beginning with a review of the questionnaire that was developed. We will review our attendance lists and decide who will receive the questionnaire. May be able to send out in April.
- OERC should review the efficacy of the current portfolio of written outreach planning & evaluation documents (available online and offline). What is working or not working and why (or why not)?
 - We interpret this to mean evaluating the OERC publications: how the publications are being used and whether they have made a difference. We will send a questionnaire to a sample of those who have obtained the guide and workbooks.
- More co-teaching would help regional evaluators to feel confident to teach these classes on their own. Training of trainers would develop capacity in each region.
 - We have been offering to co-teach classes since the beginning of this contract and *have* been co-teaching since the beginning of the contract. We are seeing progress in this area – particularly where the RML staff sees a need for a particular topic. The RML

instructors are seasoned teachers and we don't think this is a confidence problem – we think it's a time problem (ie, RML staff are very busy and have other priorities).

- Offer evaluation expertise to Web-STOC and NTCC.
 - We have worked with both centers and they know we are available to them.
- Provide updates to the regional evaluation coordinators regarding the technical support and other services that the OERC provides so that the information can be shared within the different regions as needed.
 - We do this at the evaluation liaison meetings.
- Continue with online class development and training.
 - We are doing this.
- Continue training through the rest of the contract.
 - We are doing this.
- Assessment and evaluation has implications for outreach, for project planning, for advocacy. It is important for health sciences librarians to obtain these skills and OERC needs to take the training to the librarian, because the librarian has difficulty traveling.
 - We are turning classes into distance classes.
- Raise the priority for distance education. It was always a challenge, but now it is even more difficult for librarians to travel out of their communities, their states to take a workshop.
 - Distance education is a priority, but cross-regional evaluation projects for NNO have been a higher priority because they have deadlines attached. We do put a high priority on converting the workshops when a region requests it.
- Convert other Outreach Evaluation Series workshops into distance learning webinars. Keep encouraging the development and teaching of distance learning classes about evaluation via Adobe Connect and Moodle among the RMLs.
 - This is the same recommendation at the previous one. See comments above.

Next-Level Priority—Excellent ideas that we will attempt to address

- Interview Evaluation Liaisons in each region and explore strategies to encourage evaluation activities among each region's Network members.
 - Will interview the evaluation liaisons to explore strategies.
- In the future, it might be good to come up with a more organized Evaluation Liaison system throughout the Regions than the current monthly meetings. With less funding, a more structured system may be needed to build capacity in a way that is supported by the NNO.
 - Will interview the evaluation liaisons to see what might be a better system.
- OERC should communicate directly through the All RML listserv and not depend on the Evaluation Liaisons to get the important messages out to their colleagues. Perhaps they could send out the agenda for the meetings so other RML staff can decide whether or not they want to attend.
 - The OERC wants the evaluation liaisons to be the first and primary point of contact for evaluation issues. We can ask them to share the agenda with colleagues who have an interest in the topics.
- Updating the OERC website where appropriate should be helpful. Is the goal to make that website a one-stop shop for outreach evaluation information?
 - We agree this should be addressed. We think the OERC should begin by consulting with Angela and the evaluation liaisons regarding the goal of the website.

- OERC should make more of an effort to inform all regions of the curricula for classes developed for a single region so that others can decide whether they'd like OERC to offer it in their region too (e.g., Clever evaluation, logic model, overview of evaluation.)
 - We will develop a list of topics that are available with descriptions and a list of potential topics. We could go over the list in an evaluation liaison meeting and invite the evaluation liaisons to share the list with the colleagues in the RML offices.
- Teach classes at chapter meetings. MLA gathers more attendees, but classes at the annual meeting are expensive. If the OERC would teach at chapter meetings, OERC training would be available to health sciences librarians who cannot go to MLA and at a more affordable price.
 - We will request money in the Year 5 budget to travel to chapter meetings. We will contact chapter meeting planning committees to tell them about our workshops.
- OERC should review under what circumstances is distance learning (e-learning) for outreach evaluation as effective as face-to-face. What are the trade-offs? What is the optimal mix.
 - We will explore this question somewhat with the RML Adobe Connect focus groups.
- The OERC blog is a good idea and it looks good, but it could use more content and promotion.
 - We agree with statement, but other priorities have slowed our contributions. Discuss with evaluation liaisons.
- Continue capacity building, by bringing discussions about evaluation questions into the mainstream of NN/LM communication channels. Maybe create an 'evaluation column' with Q&A that can be syndicated regionally. This could be off the current blog, or use another format. The idea would be to generate interest and discussion with Network members about evaluation topics or questions they have. Use a format which all the evaluation coordinators could easily contribute answers and comments.
 - Yes, this is important, but please see above comments.
- Additional ideas for improving communication should be considered such as developing an interactive public communication mechanism that is directed toward Network members and writing articles for the regional newsletters.
 - We think this recommendation repeats ideas in the previous recommendation. See above comments.

Effective Practices/Outreach Applications Redesign Working Group

- OERC should review the efficacy and effectiveness of current methods for capturing lessons learned in outreach evaluation. It is not clear if current methods for capturing best practices are working very well or if anyone is using the best practices.
 - Improved methods of capturing and sharing lessons learned from funded outreach projects is part of NLM's ongoing review of its outreach reporting systems. The OERC is participating in that review.
- Identify, promote, and teach outreach best practices, so lessons learned can be incorporated in planning new projects. Identify any process/outcomes data collection tools used within the NN/LM that could/should be helpful to all regions.
 - Once NLM has redesigned its outreach reporting system, it should be possible to identify effective practices. We will advocate for including data collection tools in the reports of funded projects.

Out of OERC Scope

- It would also be good [in year 05] to have a way to evaluate the evaluation training and consultation work done by the RMLs.
 - The OERC's role is support to evaluation training and consultation work done by the RML. This recommendation would change the relationships between the OERC and RMLs.
- Take a proactive, leadership role by providing feedback to RMLs on how they're doing on evaluation offering region specific recommendations.
 - This is the same recommendation as the previous one. See comments above.
- Address evaluation issues within the RML offices, not just classes for those in the region.
 - This is the same recommendation as the previous two. See comments above.
- One suggestion is that OERC advocate with NNO and RMLs for stronger RML Evaluation Liaison capabilities. This seems important to further leveraging the OERC.
 - The OERC has no authority regarding RML staff responsibilities and capabilities
- Provide evaluation guidelines to assist regions with the evaluation component of writing five-year proposals.
 - This request should be made by NNO and the guidelines should be distributed to all applicants (not just current RMLs)
- Produce an Outreach Strategies Series, comparable to the Outreach Evaluation Series. Training is needed on how to do outreach before we can evaluate how we're doing.
 - The OERC does not conduct outreach, so it would be inappropriate for us to create this series. If the outreach staff of the RMLs created this series, we could promote it
- The OERC is doing a lot of consultations and they should share the tools, and results of these consultations with the regions and with the RMLs. A condition of using the OERC's expertise should be that outputs would be shared with the Network. OERC could disseminate tested tools and share lessons learned.
 - As consultants to network members and the RMLs, we do not perceive that the tools that are produced or the results that are obtained belong to the OERC. They belong to our clients. We would be happy to *participate* in sharing tools and results with the regions and the RMLs. (Our experience is that the RMLs do post results when they think they are important or of interest to their network members.)
- Evaluate consumer outreach strategies.
 - This recommendation is out of the scope of the OERC mission because we do not do consumer outreach. Our mission is to support the RMLs and network members with their evaluation of consumer outreach strategies. Our booklet series is about evaluating outreach to consumers.

Puzzling

- Maybe it's time for an OERC Facebook page?
 - We think our time would be better spent enhancing the OERC blog.
- While it is a good idea to extend evaluation past outreach evaluation, it is important to keep OERC expert at what they do, rather than knowing a little about everything. Perhaps the title of the OERC could be changed to Outreach and Advocacy Evaluation Resource Center?
 - If the OERC name is changed, it should be changed to be more general (The NN/LM Evaluation Resource Center) rather than more specific.
- Consider using an evaluation tool other than the logic model approach.

- The logic model is by far the most popular PLANNING tool among agencies related to NN/LM's mission. We would need more information to understand this recommendation: do they have specific evaluation or planning tools in mind?
- OERC and PN/RML should advocate for restoration of budget cuts (at a minimum).
 - We don't know how to respond to this.